E 340
.A4 H6

CHARLES ALLEN

OF WORCESTER

BY

GEORGE F. HOAR.

CHARLES ALLEN

OF WORCESTER

BY

GEORGE F. HOAR.

Reprinted from Proceedings of the American Antiquarian Society,
October Meeting, 1901.

Worcester, Mass., U. S. A.
PRESS OF CHARLES HAMILTON,
311 MAIN STREET.
1902.

E340
.A4H6

Congressional
Committees
Jan 1923

CHARLES ALLEN OF WORCESTER.

If I need any justification for my choice of a subject, or for repeating things which will be very familiar to the elders in my audience, you will permit me to relate an anecdote. A few years ago an inhabitant of Worcester County, very well known and influential in the public life of this Commonwealth, told me that an aged townsman of his had said that the ablest man he ever knew was a former resident of Worcester, of whose character and influence he spoke with very great enthusiasm. But my informant said he could not remember the name. I said, "Was it Charles Allen?" "Yes," was the reply, "I think that was the name."

Our associate, Mr. Rhodes, in his admirable History, mentions Judge Allen in but a single sentence, and that one expressing an emphatic disapproval of one of the important acts of his public life.

To those of us whose memory goes back to the great days of the anti-slavery struggle it seems as surprising to find a man who had never heard of Charles Allen as to find a man who had never heard of his illustrious kinsman Sam Adams. Yet, I suppose that thirty or forty years after the close of a great political career or a great historic period is generally the time when mankind at large know least about it. Memory has begun to fade. Contemporaries are dead or grown old. History is not yet written. The documents and records which are the material for accurate history have not yet come to light.

The life of Charles Allen was in a stormy time. It became his duty to engage in bitter conflicts. After his

lamented death it did not seem desirable to those who had the best right to determine the question that those fires should be rekindled. But the story of Judge Allen's great service to liberty and of the battle in which he was one of the greatest leaders can be told now without causing pain to any one. The men who were conspicuous on both sides have gone, with very few exceptions. The people have paid to them their tribute of love and honor. They know that men who differed widely were faithful to the cause of righteousness as they believed it, and to the interest of the country as they understood it. I have often said that Charles Allen seemed to me, as a mere intellectual force, the ablest man I have known in my day, not even excepting Daniel Webster. He had a slender physical frame and a weak voice. He was not capable of severe or continued labor. He had little personal ambition. It was only under the stimulant of a great cause that he put forth his best powers; and when the pressure of that stimulant ceased, his activity seemed to cease also.

Charles Allen was born in the town of Worcester, Aug. 9th, 1797, just seventy-two years before the day of his burial. He was of the best Puritan stock. His father, Joseph Allen, was a distinguished and public-spirited citizen, clerk of the courts, and a member of Congress in 1810 and 1811. Judge Allen's great-grandfather was Samuel Adams, the father of the illustrious patriot, who manifested in a high degree the intellectual and moral traits for which his descendants were so conspicuous. *The Independent Advertiser* of March 14, 1748, contains the following notice of the elder Samuel Adams:—"Last Week died, and was decently interr'd the Remains of, *Samuel Adams*, Esq.; a Gentleman who sustained many public, Offices among us, and for some Years past represented this town in the General Assembly—He was one who well understood and rightly pursued the Civil and Religious Interests of this People—A true *New England*

man — An honest Patriot — Help, Lord, for such wise and godly men cease, and such faithful members fail from among the Sons of *New England*." The only son of the famous Samuel Adams died before his father. Joseph Allen, who was often a member of the Legislature, found a home in the household of his illustrious kinsman, to whom he was as a son, and for many years shared his inmost confidence as it was given to no other person whatever. The traditions of Sam Adams were familiar to the family of Joseph Allen. His mental and moral traits; his opinions; his inflexible principles; his ardent and unquenchable love of liberty; his style and mode of speech; his features as they are represented in Copley's masterpiece in Faneuil Hall, — were reproduced in large degree in the sons of Joseph Allen.[1] Charles Allen entered Yale College in 1811, but was never graduated. He studied law in the office of Samuel M. Burnside. His preparation was a most diligent and faithful study of common law principles in a very few standard authorities, especially Blackstone, in whose style, clear definitions and orderly arrangement he very much delighted, and much of which he could repeat almost verbatim. He was not given to an extensive study of cases. Indeed, in his preparation for arguments at the bar, after a thorough examination of a very few leading cases, he did not care for a study of decisions of the courts, but preferred to mature his arguments in his own mind during his solitary walks into the country, or as he paced backward and forward in his office. But I was told by his brother George that when he was examined for admission to the Bar the examiners were so delighted by the extent of his learning and his prompt and clear solution of the legal problems by which they tested him that they prolonged the examination a good while for their own gratification.

[1] There is a lady living now, the widow of our late Librarian, Mr. Haven, who is of the race of Charles Allen, and at times when her face is lighted up by some emotion, you would think Sam Adams was standing before you.

Mr. Allen's literary training was of a like character. He made himself very familiar with English classic poetry. He read the entire fifty volumes of the old edition of the British Poets. With a few of these he made himself so familiar that he could repeat their best passages. Beyond this he never cared much to extend his reading, except that he made himself familiar with the great historians who have written the annals of constitutional liberty. He had a great fondness for the history of New England. He knew all about the growth of its religious opinions and of the simple Congregational form of church government which is both the cause and the result of so much that is best in the character of our people. With these exceptions, he was not what would be called a scholar. He cared nothing for the trifles either of history or literature. His preparation for the duties of his profession and of life was by profound original thought. He was admitted to the Bar at the age of twenty-one, and began his professional life in New Braintree. In 1824 he returned to Worcester, which was his home for the rest of his life.

From this time until the movement for the annexation of Texas in 1844-5, the career of Charles Allen was that of a leader at the very able Bar of a large county; of an eminent judge; of a man influential in the public life of the community where he lived, and of the Commonwealth. With a single exception, to be mentioned presently, he had taken no part in national affairs. His name was little known beyond the borders of Massachusetts except to such members of his profession as had heard of him from their brethren here. He soon became known as a powerful advocate whose opinions on questions of law were quite sure to be those finally adopted by the court; whom it was almost impossible to dislodge from any position he deliberately occupied; and from whom no antagonist could wrest a verdict of a Worcester County jury in a cause in whose justice he himself believed. There is but one

story preserved by the traditions of the Bar of his making any serious mistake. It is said that, getting an execution for a client for a large debt, which was to be satisfied by a levy on land of a debtor who was deeply insolvent, where he had the first attachment, under his direction a portion of a large tract of land in which the debtor had an undivided interest was set off by metes and bounds, a proceeding which is, as is well known to all good lawyers now, utterly void. The young man discovered his mistake just after it was too late to correct it. He was much distressed and came to Worcester to consult old Major Newton, one of the wisest and safest of our elder lawyers. The Major advised Mr. Allen to say nothing about the mistake, but at once to bring a writ of entry against the owner of the title in the hope that the mistake might not be discovered, and that he might get a judgment or a disclaimer. This was done, and the flaw in the title of the Judge's client was never discovered until he had made it perfect.

He never could get interested in a case in which he did not believe. He had no fondness for exercising his ingenuity in the defence of a cause which did not seem to him just. But when his sympathies were aroused by what he deemed an attempt to practise an injustice upon his client, he was, I believe, as formidable an antagonist as ever tried a case in a Massachusetts court-house. His cross-examination was terrible. It dragged a lying witness out of all concealments or subterfuges and seemed to lay bare the very depths of his soul. His style was a model of nervous, compact, vigorous English, rising sometimes to a very lofty eloquence. He had a gift of sarcasm which he indulged sometimes when it would have been better to restrain it, and inflicted an undeserved sting upon amiable and sensitive men. His ordinary manner in the trial of a cause was quiet. He remained silent while the evidence was going in, except in the most important parts of the

case, and even a very able lawyer might try a case against him which did not excite special interest on the part of Mr. Allen, without discovering his great power.

His quality as an advocate is well described by a most competent and accomplished observer, the late Dwight Foster, as follows:—"He never called any man his intellectual master. Though the ordinary methods of legal investigation were distasteful to him, yet he was fond of communing with his own mind in silent and profound thought. His preparation in the use of books was usually slight, but he never failed to give abundant reflection to every important matter intrusted to his professional care.

"Accordingly, he entered upon the trial of a case thoroughly prepared and equipped in his own peculiar way. His mental processes were exceedingly rapid and his intuitive judgment wonderfully correct. He was the wisest counsellor I ever called to my aid.

"In the crisis of a trial he never faltered or quailed. If his manner grew a little more quiet, his face a little paler, and a dangerous light was emitted from his eyes, his adversary had better beware, for he was sure to prove himself a tremendous antagonist. His cross-examinations were sometimes terrific. When roused he would pour forth a torrent of sarcasm and invective that like a lava flood scorched and burned everything over which it flowed. He could be eloquent upon worthy occasions. He had no cheap rhetoric for ordinary use. His legal discussions usually began with conceded elementary principles, on which as a foundation he would erect a superstructure of close and cogent argumentation. It was his custom to show what the law ought to be and in the nature of the case must be, paying comparatively little attention to what it had been on some former occasion decided to be."

When I came to the Bar in 1849, the young lawyers used to beguile the time at their meetings with anecdotes of the sharp retorts, the readiness in difficult places in a trial, and

the wonderful skill in cross-examination of Charles Allen. Most of them are forgotten now. Judge Allen represented Worcester in the Massachusetts House of Representatives in 1829, 1833, 1834 and 1840. He was a member of the State Senate in 1835, 1836 and 1837. When in the House of Representatives he was one of the most influential persons in procuring the state aid for the Western Railroad, a measure to which the commercial and manufacturing prosperity of Massachusetts, and especially of the City of Worcester, have been so largely due.

Judge Allen was upon the committee to count the vote for Governor after the election of 1839. The Legislature contained a majority of Whigs, as of course did the committee who counted the votes for Governor and Lieutenant-Governor. The count resulted, according to the first enumeration by the committee, and according to their report, in showing that no person had a majority, the result of which would have been that the election would have been made by the Legislature, and Mr. Everett, the Whig candidate, would have been chosen. But it came to the knowledge of Judge Allen that an error had been made, the correction of which would show that Gov. Morton was chosen by a majority of one vote. The Judge, himself a Whig, announced this discovery to the House. The mistake was corrected and Gov. Morton declared elected.

Mr. Allen was appointed judge of the old Court of Common Pleas in 1842. This court consisted in his time of John M. Williams, Chief Justice, Charles H. Warren, Charles Allen and Solomon Strong. Probably no state in the Union at that time possessed a Supreme Court of greater ability than this, the second court in rank in Massachusetts. Chief Justice Williams was a model of the judicial character; Warren was not only a very learned and sound lawyer, but distinguished for his brilliant wit and eminent social quality. When the Democratic party

came into power in 1843 it sought to gain popular favor by a reduction of the salaries of the Supreme Judicial Court, a measure clearly opposed to the letter of the Constitution, and by a reduction of the salaries of the Court of Common Pleas, a measure equally opposed to its spirit and to all sound policy. On the return of the Whigs to power the next year, the salary of the Supreme Court was restored to its former scale, and the sum which had been unconstitutionally withheld during the year, paid. But the Whig party, desiring to get some favor from men of frugal mind, omitted to restore the salaries of the judges of the Court of Common Pleas to the old standard. Thereupon, in 1844, the members of that court, including Judge Allen, resigned, much to the public regret. During Mr. Allen's term of office the celebrated Wyman trial, in which Mr. Webster, Mr. Choate and Franklin Dexter were employed for the defence, was tried three times. One of the trials was before Judge Allen. At this trial occurred the celebrated conflict between Judge Allen and Mr. Webster. The story is variously related, even by persons who were present on the occasion. The commonly accepted version, and one which is doubtless in substance correct, is that Mr. Webster was quite uneasy under the powerful and luminous charge of the Judge, and rose once or twice to call the Judge's attention to what he supposed to be a mistake of fact or law. After one or two interruptions of this sort, Mr. Webster rising again, the Judge said, "Mr. Webster, I cannot suffer myself to be interrupted now." To which Mr. Webster replied, "I cannot suffer my client's case to be misrepresented." To which the Judge replied, "Sit down, sir." The charge proceeded without further interruption, and the jury were sent to their room. Mr. Allen then turned to Mr. Webster and said, "Mr. Webster"— Whereupon Mr. Webster rose with all the grace and courtesy of manner of which, when he chose, he was master, and said, "Will your honor pardon me a

moment," and proceeded to make a handsome apology and expression of regret for the occurrence. The occurrence was deemed by the profession greatly to the credit of both these eminent persons. Mr. Allen returned to the practice of the law, and continued to support himself by his profession, except so far as he was interrupted by his public and political occupations, until he was appointed Chief Justice of the Superior Court of the County of Suffolk by Gov. Banks, in 1858, and soon after, in the following year, was appointed Chief Justice of the Superior Court of the Commonwealth. He had been, in the interval, offered a place upon the bench of the Supreme Court, which he had declined. On the retirement of Chief Justice Shaw, in 1860, he was offered by Governor Banks the position of Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Massachusetts. This he was compelled to decline by reason of his slender health and his incapacity for the continuous and severe labor which the duties of the judges of that court require. This fact is stated by Gov. Banks in his farewell address.

Judge Allen said to the late Judge Foster:—"At my age and in my state of health it is not to be thought of. It might have been different once, yet few know how much physical weakness I have had to contend with through life, and how much has been attributed to indolence in me which was caused by the necessity of nursing my health."

Mr. Allen held the office of Chief Justice of the Superior Court until the infirmities of old age came upon him. But there were a few terms of the court where, in summing up to the jury the evidence upon the facts, he repeated himself in a manner that showed the impairment of his faculties; but even then his statement of the legal principles applicable to the case showed his accustomed clearness, vigor and soundness of judgment.

While he was Judge of the Court of Common Pleas he

presided at several trials of great importance. In the Wyman trial already referred to, his charge won the commendation of the able members of the Bar who listened to it, including Mr. Webster himself, for its great ability. The charge of the Judge was universally conceded to be not a whit behind the argument of Webster in grasp and completeness. He also presided in a cause which was tried at Dedham, growing out of the Dorr Rebellion, in which Rufus Choate and Mr. Whipple of Rhode Island were the principal counsel. Some very intricate questions arose in the case, and the Judge's rulings were watched with great care. When one of them was made, the venerable Judge Putnam, who was present as a spectator, shook his head in dissent; but at the recess went to the Judge and told him he was right. Chief Justice Spencer of New York, who read the report of the trial, wrote to the Judge an approving and complimentary letter.

During Judge Allen's service as Chief Justice of the Superior Court, a fugitive slave who had made his escape from a New Orleans vessel, was pursued by the master of the vessel and seized just as he was landing, and taken back to slavery. The indignation of the people was deeply stirred. The captain of the vessel was arrested subsequently and brought to trial before Judge Allen. A question, then not very well settled, arose as to whether the act was committed within the jurisdiction of the Commonwealth. The people heard with great satisfaction that the kidnapper was to be brought to trial before a court presided over by the great abolitionist. But the Judge held the scales with absolute impartiality. He taught the whole people of the country that even a slave-catcher could not fail in his reliance on the justice of Massachusetts; and that her indignation against what she deemed the worst of outrages, the kidnapping of a human being, could not swerve her from her obedience to law. The man was acquitted, by reason of the ruling of the Court

that the offence was not committed within the body of the county.

Judge Allen's influence over men seemed, like that of Alexander Hamilton, to be greater in proportion to the ability of the man with whom he dealt. Great as was his power over juries and over popular assemblies, it was greater over judges and courts. He was an admirable negotiator. The extent of his service in the negotiation of the Ashburton Treaty of 1842 will never be fully known. It rests only on tradition and on the weighty evidence of Mr. Webster. There was probably never a subject in regard to which the national feeling of the American people was more deeply excited than the controversy with Great Britain concerning our northeastern boundary. In 1842 the feeling engendered by the War of the Revolution and the War of 1812 had not grown cold. Great Britain was regarded as our natural and hereditary foe. The tone of her press, the utterances of her public men and the criticism of her literary journals tended to stimulate and exasperate this feeling. The lessons of two wars had not taught her to treat us with respect. The contempt which, the Spanish proverb says, pierces the shell of the tortoise, she poured out abundantly upon nerves always unduly sensitive to the opinion of other nations. The territory which was in dispute belonged wholly to Massachusetts until the separation of Maine in 1820, and consisted very largely of unsettled lands which had been divided between Massachusetts and Maine, and were still largely owned by the former state, subject to the local jurisdiction of Maine. Every effort to settle this controversy, which had been the subject of negotiation almost ever since the peace of 1783, had but increased the difficulties with which it was beset, by exhausting the expedients both of diplomacy and arbitration. Mr. Webster undertook the settlement of this question, with others which had caused great irritation in the two coun-

tries, and probably regarded its solution as, with scarcely an exception, the most important public service of his life. The difficulty of the negotiation was increased by the fact that any treaty which should be made would require the assent of a two-thirds majority of the Senate. So that the political opponents of the administration must be willing, for patriotic reasons, to abandon the temptation of assailing it with the charge of having unduly surrendered the rights of this country to its ancient and hated rival, if the treaty contained anything of concession or compromise. It was quite clear that no treaty could pass the Senate without the consent of Maine and Massachusetts. The former state was politically opposed to Mr. Webster. His first step was to invite the co-operation of the two states immediately concerned, to request them to appoint agents to take part in the negotiation and to assure them "that no line of boundary should be agreed to without their consent, and without their consent, also, to all the conditions and stipulations of the treaty respecting the boundary." To this the two states agreed. But they further stipulated that their consent should only be given in case the agents of both states were unanimous. Maine appointed as commissioners Edward Kavanagh, Edward Kent, William P. Preble and John Otis. Massachusetts appointed Abbott Lawrence, John Mills and Charles Allen.

It is well known that to Judge Allen's influence was very largely due the success of the treaty. He went carefully over the matter with Gen. Scott. He gave the most thorough study to the whole question, especially to the matter of the military strength of the frontier as it would be left by the compromise line which was adopted. He became satisfied that whatever might be the title of Massachusetts to the lands held by Great Britain under the treaty, or whatever the right of the United States to hold them as against Great Britain, that the country and the state obtained far more than an equivalent, and that it was

especially for the interest of Massachusetts as a great commercial state that this irritating question should be forever put at rest and that our peaceful intercourse with Great Britain should be uninterrupted. It was well understood at the time that to Judge Allen's great influence was largely due the unanimous action of his associates, the commissioners of the two states. Mr. Webster himself bore the strongest testimony to this fact. Besides other instances of it, he met Judge Allen's brother, the Rev. George Allen, a short time after the treaty had been ratified, and spoke of his great obligation to his brother, and added, with great emphasis, "Your brother is a great arranger of men."

The portion of Mr. Allen's public life upon which his title to the gratitude of his countrymen chiefly rests began with the movement for the annexation of Texas, during the presidency of John Tyler. The avowed and the direct object of this annexation was to prevent the abolition of slavery in the vast territory of Texas itself, which would else become free. The ultimate object was to give the control of the government to the South; to make slave states of the territory between the Mississippi and the Pacific, to impress indelibly upon the United States the character which Macaulay attributed to her in 1845:— "That nation is the champion and upholder of slavery. They seek to extend slavery with more energy than was ever exerted by any other nation to diffuse civilization."

Up to this time Mr. Allen had been content with the duties which came to him as a leading member of his profession and a leading citizen of this important community. He was fond of social and family life. His profession, in which he was easily the leader in Worcester County, gave him an income sufficient to support his family and indulge his frugal tastes. The highest places on the bench of his state were open to him. But the kinsman of Sam Adams could not be indifferent

to the momentous issues which were at stake in the coming conflict with the slave power. Mr. Allen issued a call for a convention in Worcester County in the autumn of 1844. This was followed by the state convention called under the advice of Mr. Webster, held at Faneuil Hall, on the 29th day of January, 1845.

The annexation of Texas and the war with Mexico are wonderful examples among those so numerous in our history where the God who is on the side of Freedom has graciously turned the evil purposes of men to the accomplishment of his will. During the period which followed the administration of Andrew Jackson the statesmen of the South became alarmed for the power which that section had wielded in the government, with the brief exception of the administration of John Adams and that of his son, from the beginning. It had been an unequal contest between the great skill as politicians of the Southerners and the strength and progress which free institutions had brought to the North. Mr. Calhoun and his associates proposed to turn the scale in favor of the South by the addition of Texas. Some of them doubtless contemplated even at that day the disruption of the Union and a slaveholding empire whose northern boundary should be Mason and Dixon's line, which should extend from the Atlantic to the Pacific, should include Cuba and a large portion, if not the whole, of the territory of Mexico. Mr. Van Buren, who had never failed before in subserviency to the slave power, refused to become a party to the plan. John Tyler, who had been placed upon the ticket with General Harrison to conciliate the friends of Mr. Clay in Virginia, was thoroughly devoted to this scheme for strengthening and extending slavery.

Texas declared her independence during the presidency of Andrew Jackson. In the last Congress of President Jackson's administration an appropriation was made and authority given to enable him to establish diplomatic rela-

tions with Texas when, in his judgment, the proper time had come. This measure was supported by representatives of both parties and both sections, including Mr. Webster. President Jackson, with what to many people seemed undue haste, instantly acted upon the authority and recognized the independence of Texas. This recognition was followed by an overture from Texas for admission to the Union during the administration of Mr. Van Buren. Mr. Van Buren rejected the overture, in which he was supported by Mr. Benton and other leading Southern Democrats. But Van Buren forever forfeited the confidence of the mass of the slaveholders thereby. Mr. Webster, in his great speech at Niblo's Garden, early in the year 1837, took very strong ground against the admission of Texas, claiming that the admission of a foreign state to our Union was not within the constitutional power of the government; and, further, that while he proposed to sustain to their fullest extent the existing constitutional provisions which favored slavery, he would not submit to extending them beyond the original territory of the Union and thereby disturbing the relations of the different parts of the country to each other. The opposition of the Democratic president and the great Whig statesman seemed for a time to put an end to the project. Texas withdrew her offer and seemed to be intent on establishing herself as a separate nation. The question was scarcely heard of in the great campaign of 1840. But the death of General Harrison brought John Tyler into the chair and gave the slave power its opportunity. When President Tyler abandoned the fiscal policy of his party the members of his cabinet resigned, except Mr. Webster, who remained until the Ashburton Treaty with Great Britain was completed. But, while his friendly relations with President Tyler were unbroken, Mr. Webster was made to feel in many ways that his presence at the council table was unwelcome. He accordingly resigned

his seat in the cabinet and was succeeded, first by Mr. Grimke, then by Mr. Upshur, who, soon after, gave place to Mr. Calhoun. The project of Texas annexation was thereafter vigorously pressed to its consummation. Mr. Calhoun negotiated the treaty with Texas, providing for its coming as a state into the Union, which was rejected by the Senate, for want of the two-thirds vote required by the Constitution. The issue was presented to the people of the United States in the presidential campaign of 1844, and was decided by the election of James K. Polk. Mr. Clay, although opposed to the annexation of Texas under the circumstances then existing, tried to conciliate the slaveholders by a statement that, under some circumstances, he should have personally no objection to the measure. He failed to gain any Southern friends of Texas, and lost the confidence of many anti-slavery men at the North, whose vote, given to James G. Birney, cost Mr. Clay the State of New York, and with it the election.

At the short session of 1844-5, at the close of President Tyler's administration, and after the election of Mr. Polk, a joint resolution was adopted, giving the consent of Congress to the erection of a new state from the territory of Texas, on certain conditions therein set forth, in order that the same might be admitted into the Union; and to the admission of such state whenever the time and conditions of such admission and of the cession to the United States of the remaining territory of Texas should be agreed upon by the two governments.

Texas complied with the conditions in the interval, and Congress passed a joint resolution in December, 1845, declaring the conditions complied with and formally admitting Texas as a state. After the passage of the first resolution above-named a division grew up in the Whig party between those persons who desired to resist the admission of Texas to the end, and who claimed that this action of Congress could and ought to be repealed; and

those who, either because they considered further agitation useless, or because they thought that the business interests of the North required the subject to be dropped, or because the gratification of their personal ambitions seemed to them dependent upon Southern favor, were for treating the question as settled. This latter class contained some of the best and wisest of the Whig statesmen of Massachusetts, who dreaded and deprecated the formation upon this issue of a sectional party, and who thought the best means of resisting the further aggression of slavery was to retain their political association with the Whigs of the South. Conspicuous among these were Mr. Winthrop, Mr. Edward Everett, Governor Lincoln and Mr. Abbott Lawrence, to neither of whom will any man, whatever may have been the judgment of contemporary passion, now impute any lack of patriotism or want of sincerity in his resistance to the annexation of Texas. The two divisions of the Whig party in Massachusetts were called by names suggested by Mr. E. R. Hoar in a speech in the Massachusetts Senate: "Conscience Whigs" and "Cotton Whigs." Judge Allen threw himself into the contest with all his might, and was, from that time until he took his seat upon the bench in 1858, deemed by a large portion of the men who were of his way of thinking their wisest, bravest and ablest leader.

Mr. Webster was, for a time, expected to unite with the Conscience Whigs. He had either originally suggested, or at any rate earnestly united in the call for a convention of the people of Massachusetts, to be held in Faneuil Hall on the 29th of January, 1845, to express her unconquerable repugnance to the admission of Texas. He seemed to be inspired with a purpose to resist to the end, with all his might, the annexation of Texas, which he regarded as a violation of the Constitution and as designed to secure the perpetual supremacy of the slaveholding interest in this country. He undertook to prepare for the convention an address to the people of Massachusetts. He met

Charles Allen and Stephen C. Phillips at his office, I think, on Sunday, the 26th day of January. I have heard Judge Allen himself relate the story, but I will not be absolutely certain as to the day. He walked backward and forward in his office dictating to them the portion of the pamphlet containing the constitutional argument which terminates at paragraph second on the tenth page. "It affirms to you," to quote Mr. Webster's own language, "that there is no constitutional power in any branch of the government, or in all the branches of the government, to annex a foreign state to this Union." It will require no external testimony to convince any man who reads them that these pages are the work of Mr. Webster. Judge Allen and Mr. Phillips alternately used the pen, while Mr. Webster dictated. When this branch of the argument was completed Mr. Webster looked at his watch, said it was time to go to dinner, and made an appointment for them to continue their work at the same place at a fixed hour the next day. The next day Mr. Webster did not appear and nothing was heard of him. Mr. Allen and Mr. Phillips waited until late in the afternoon when they were informed, to their dismay, that Mr. Webster had taken a train for New York,—the train then left Boston at half-past five in the afternoon, connecting with the Norwich boat. Judge Allen was compelled to finish the address himself, to have it ready for the convention on Wednesday. The part composed by him begins at the place above indicated on page ten, and constitutes the rest of the pamphlet. It is praise enough, but not too much, to say of the work of Judge Allen that it is entirely worthy of its companionship, and that a casual reader, not informed of the history of the production, would not be likely to discover that the address was not the work of a single hand.

It is said that on that Monday a large pecuniary contribution for Mr. Webster was raised among the business men of Boston. Judge Allen believed that the indication

of the strength of the sentiment among this class of persons of unwillingness that there should be further agitation of the Texas question and further disturbance of harmonious relations between the North and the South caused this sudden change of purpose in the mind of Mr. Webster.

I do not for a moment mean to imply that Mr. Webster could be corrupted by money. I am satisfied, from a most careful and conscientious study, extending over many years, of his great career, that he was actuated by the loftiest patriotism in the action in his last years which, in common with so many of his countrymen, I disapproved at the time and disapprove now.

I do not know what caused his sudden change of purpose in those two days. But I conjecture that there came to his knowledge in the interval the fact that so many of his life-long friends and supporters among the business men of Boston were against further resistance to the annexation of Texas, and he concluded that resistance was hopeless and that it was not worth while to butt his head against a wall, by mere ineffective and barren remonstrance.

It would have been vastly better if Mr. Webster had absolutely refused such pecuniary contributions while he was in public life. His callousness upon that subject, as was his indifference to debt, and his profuseness of personal expenditure, was a blot on his otherwise illustrious character. But we may say this and at the same time acquit him of the supreme and unpardonable infamy of corruption. Mr. Webster's fame is among the great treasures of the Republic. Let him be judged by his whole career, and not alone by what may seem his errors of judgment in one supreme, anxious and dangerous time.

It is undoubtedly true that Mr. Webster, by his failure to attend the Anti-Texas Convention on the following Wednesday, or to express any further his sympathy with the sentiment which was so deeply felt by the anti-slavery people of Massachusetts, did much to weaken his hold on

their affection and confidence. When, at the Free Soil Convention at Worcester, in 1848, one of the resolutions called upon Daniel Webster, in the name of Massachusetts, to take the action in behalf of freedom in the territories "to which his great heart and mind should lead him," it was received by numerous shouts of "No, no," and its passage was secured with great difficulty. Mr. Allen's cordial relations with Mr. Webster were never renewed.

From the time of the consummation of the annexation of Texas it was apparent to all thoughtful men that it was the purpose of the slave power to occupy all that remained of the territory of the United States, together with what might be wrested from Mexico, and to wrest the Island of Cuba from Spain, and to bring all this territory into the Union of the States when the time should come. To apprise the people of the North of this purpose, to resist it and to defeat it, became thenceforth the paramount object of the political life of Charles Allen and of the men who sympathized with him. The Whig party of the North professed to be opposed to the extension of slavery. It was committed to that policy by the resolutions of its conventions, both state and local, in nearly all the Northern States. But many of its leaders were dependent on Southern favor for the gratification of their ambition in the future. Large numbers of Whigs, especially those engaged in manufactures and in mercantile pursuits, considered that the prosperity of the North in its business depended on maintaining undisturbed relations with the South. In addition to all this, there were large portions of the North, including southern Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, large portions of Pennsylvania and of New Jersey, where the Negro was held in little higher estimation than at the South, and where he was believed, to quote a phrase which afterward became a proverb, "to have no rights which the white man was bound to respect." The party spirit, too, led zealous Whig politicians to be unwilling to insist upon

a doctrine which must necessarily split the party in twain at Mason and Dixon's line. There were others who were conscientious in their disapprobation of slavery and who were unwilling that it should be extended, but who thought that Northern opposition only served to inflame Southern aggression, which, if the discussion of the question should be dismissed from politics for a time, would die out of itself. And to this number were added all the conservative, timid, quiet and amiable persons who disliked nothing so much as strife or agitation. Mr. Allen, however, found a good many associates and friends, many of whom afterward became distinguished in politics or letters. Each of them was a man who was competent to be the leader of a great cause.

The division in the Whig party, which began after the annexation of Texas, was widened by the differences growing out of the war with Mexico. This was disapproved by the Whigs of Massachusetts with scarcely an exception. But there was a very great difference in the degree and manner of their disapproval. Many of them were exceedingly unwilling to take a position in regard to that war, which was popular throughout the country, which would bring upon them the fate which attended the position of the Federalists of 1812.

The measure providing supplies for the army in Mexico which had passed Congress had the preamble: "Whereas war exists by the act of Mexico." Against this preamble fourteen Whigs voted. But others, including Mr. Winthrop of Massachusetts, voted for the preamble, in order not to be put in the attitude of objecting to the supplies. For this they were bitterly denounced, and the division between them and the Conscience Whigs was intensified. Dr. Palfrey, the Whig representative in Congress from the Middlesex District, refused, in the next Congress, to vote for Mr. Winthrop, the Whig candidate for Speaker; and a band of Conscience Whigs voted against Mr. Winthrop

when he was chosen Representative from the Boston District. They first nominated Charles Sumner as Mr. Winthrop's opponent. Mr. Sumner declined, and Dr. Samuel G. Howe was nominated in his place. Some of the Whigs, including Mr. Webster and Senator Roger S. Baldwin of Connecticut, resisted the treaty at the close of the Mexican War, foreseeing that the strife between Freedom and Slavery for the territory which it acquired from Mexico would lead to disruption of the Whig party and to a sectional strife throughout the country.

The question whether a great public evil should be corrected by the old English and American process of action by political parties, or by an action which should be not only independent of party obligations, but of the primal obligation of citizenship to obey the will of the country as expressed by its majority, until that majority could be persuaded to change, presented itself to the men who acted under the lead of Charles Allen and Charles Sumner. They rejected Mr. Garrison's solution of that question and accepted Mr. Allen's. The result is full of instruction.

Mr. Garrison and his followers declared the Constitution a "covenant with death and a league with hell," and the country an instrument of oppression, and refused to have any connection with either. Mr. Allen and Mr. Sumner, on the other hand, said: "We will use the powers of the Constitution to correct the mistakes of the Constitution. We will appeal to the people who made the Constitution, and to the Country which is behind the Constitution. Notwithstanding the present attitude of the majority, we will place the Country and the Constitution on the side of Freedom." What was the result? Garrison and Phillips attacked the Republican party as severely and as bitterly as they had attacked the slaveholders. In thirty years of agitation they had made no progress whatever. They began in 1830. The period from 1830 to 1850 witnessed a series of victories for slavery. In 1858 Wendell

Phillips describes England, whose conduct in 1834 in abolishing slavery in the West Indies had inspired him with so much enthusiasm, as having a pro-slavery government, and as ready to reëstablish the slave trade. He declares that we are about to admit Kansas as a slave State, to seize Cuba and what remains of Mexico; that the slave-master may travel through the North with his slave without setting him free. He denounces the judges and the churches alike as given over to the domination of slavery. He says that, when he dies, he hopes some one will give him a piece of marble large enough to write on it—"Infidel" at the top and "Traitor" at the bottom.

Now, what was done by the politician? Some of us met at Worcester, Massachusetts, on the 28th of June, 1848, to found a new party, devoted to arresting the future encroachments of the slave power, and to secure the freedom of the vast territory between the Mississippi and the Pacific. At Buffalo, in the same year, that party nominated its candidate for President. In that year it did not command a single vote in the electoral colleges and chose but three members of Congress. But it increased rapidly in numbers and political power. In eight years it carried a majority of the free states. In twelve years it elected its President and had a majority in both Houses of Congress. In sixteen years it had abolished slavery and had put down the Rebellion; and in twenty years it had adopted the three great amendments to the Constitution which made every slave a freeman, every freeman a citizen, and every citizen a voter.

The life of John Quincy Adams was drawing to a close. No man questioned the sincerity of Mr. Adams's hatred of the slave power. He hated slavery for its own sake, and there was no man more certain to return the hatred which the slave power felt toward him. But he earnestly desired the extension of our territory to the Pacific, and was quite willing to take the risks of conflict between freedom and

slavery for its possession. With the exception of Mr. Adams, the anti-slavery men among the Whig leaders were opposed to the acquisition of territory from Mexico. And some others, who were ready for any compromise, deprecated the new acquisition as one to be fruitful of a strife which would endanger the national existence itself. But all opposition was without avail. The treaty of Guadaloupe Hidalgo was agreed upon by the representatives of the two governments and ratified by the Senate of the United States. Under it we acquired a vast territory of nearly 50,000 square miles. From this time the division in the Whig party became irreconcilable. The Conscience Whigs attended the conventions of their party, secured the adoption of resolutions, both in those conventions and by the Legislature, committing the party to legislation to prevent the extension of slavery into the territories, and found organs among the Whig press. The party was not broken until the nomination of Gen. Taylor in 1848. Though very much dissatisfied with Mr. Webster, probably the bulk of those who left the Whig party would have supported him if he had been the Whig candidate for the presidency. But the choice of Gen. Taylor, a Southerner and a large slaveholder, whose fame rested wholly on his achievements in a war undertaken for the extension of slavery, without any pledge or assurance of his own opposition to it, and, after letters written by him assured the South that it could depend upon him, made further support of the Whig party impossible to these men. The convention was called at Worcester on the 28th of June, 1848, where, for the first time, was inaugurated a party for the sole object of resisting the extension of slavery. The Liberty party, which had cast a few votes in the presidential election of 1840, and which, in 1844, had turned the scale in New York, and so in the nation, against Mr. Clay, was willing to support the candidates of other parties who were personally unexceptionable to them in this respect. But the

Free Soil party, of which the present Republican party is but the continuation under a change of name, determined that no person could receive its support for any national office who, himself, continued his association with either of the old political organizations.

Charles Allen was chosen a delegate from the Worcester District to the Whig National Convention which met at Philadelphia, June 7th, 1848. It became manifest, as the time for holding that convention approached, that it was the plan of a large portion of the Whig party to make no declaration of a purpose to oppose the extension of slavery into the territories, and to nominate a candidate who should be uncommitted upon that subject, and who might be represented to the South as holding one opinion and to the North as holding another. While Mr. Webster's course had not been wholly satisfactory to the opponents of the extension of slavery, and while he had seemed to lack zeal in resisting the final consummation of the annexation of Texas, yet his opposition to the extension of slavery had been many times earnestly and emphatically expressed. He would, doubtless, have received the united support of the Whig party at the North if he had been nominated. The Southern Whigs found their candidate in Zachary Taylor. His simple, manly and picturesque character had gained a strong hold on the popular heart. There were many Whigs, even in Massachusetts, who were uneasy under the somewhat dictatorial and imperious manner of Mr. Webster, and who did not expect to find much opportunity for the gratification of their own ambitions under an administration where he should control. Above all, it was supposed that the popular enthusiasm for a successful soldier would be as powerful in the case of Taylor as it had been in the case of Andrew Jackson. Mr. Webster, whatever may have been the respect in which he was held by the great mass of the people, seems never to have been popular with the class of men who are

found in nominating conventions. The result was that Gen. Taylor received the nomination of the convention on the fourth ballot by a majority of more than sixty. A resolution was then introduced declaring that Congress had the power, and that it was its duty, to prevent the introduction and existence of slavery in any territory then possessed, or which might thereafter be acquired. This resolution was laid on the table amid a storm of derision. It was, however, hoped to conciliate Massachusetts by the nomination of Abbott Lawrence, who had been an earnest supporter of Gen. Taylor, and was understood to be on unfriendly terms with Mr. Webster, for the Vice-Presidency. A gentleman then rose, of slender figure and voice, who was unknown to the great majority of the convention, and who, till that time, had taken little part in its proceedings. It was Charles Allen of Massachusetts. He declared that the discipline of the South had again prevailed; that the terms of union between the Whigs of the North and the Whigs of the South were the perpetual surrender by the former of the high places and powers of the Government to their Southern Confederates. "To these terms the Free States will no longer submit. The Whig party is here and this day dissolved. You have put one ounce too much on the strong back of Northern endurance. You have even presumed that the State which led in the first revolution for liberty will now desert that cause for the miserable boon of the Vice-Presidency. Sir, Massachusetts spurns the bribe." Mr. Allen's speech was received with a storm of indignation and derision. The Whig party, which had just nominated a successful general and which looked forward to an assured victory in the coming campaign, never appeared, to an unthinking observer, so conscious of its strength and so certain of a long lease of power as at that moment. It was about to elect its candidate for the Presidency at the slight price of silence on the great question of human liberty. Mr.

Allen's utterance seemed, to most men, like the raving of a fanatic. But in the next presidential election the Whig party, this great historic party, found itself able to command a majority in but four states. Four years from the time of Mr. Allen's utterance, Daniel Webster, as he lay dying at Marshfield, said to the friend who was making his will, "The Whig candidate will obtain but one or two states; and it is well; as a national party the Whigs are ended."

Mr. Allen came back to Massachusetts to appeal to the people of Worcester, and to lay in this city the foundation of the great party which came into power in 1861, and whose thirty years of power constitute the most brilliant and important period in all legislative history. The number of voters to whom he could appeal for support with confidence was not very large in the beginning. But there were men in all parts of the Commonwealth with whom he had been in the habit of taking counsel since the division in the Whig party had grown up, and who came promptly to his side. The Free Soil party of Massachusetts cast, in the presidential election of 1848, about thirty-seven thousand votes. But it included among its supporters almost every man in the Commonwealth old enough to take part in politics who has since acquired any considerable national reputation. Charles Sumner, who had become known to the public as an orator and scholar by three or four brilliant orations, was just at the threshold of his great career. Charles Francis Adams, who had served with distinction in each branch of the State Legislature, brought to the cause his inflexible courage, his calm judgment, and the inspiration of his historic name. John A. Andrew, then a young lawyer in Boston, afterward to become illustrious as the greatest war governor in the Union, devoted to the cause an eloquence stimulant and inspiring as a sermon of Paul. John G. Palfrey, then a Whig member of Congress from the

Middlesex District, discussed the great issue in speeches singularly adapted to reach the understanding and gratify the taste of the people of Massachusetts, and in a series of essays whose vigor and compactness Junius might have envied, and with a moral power which Junius could never have reached. Anson Burlingame, afterward minister to China and envoy from China to the civilized nations of the world, then in early youth, inspired his hearers with his lofty trumpet-call. Samuel G. Howe, famous in both hemispheres by his knightly service in the cause of Greek independence, famous also by his philanthropic work in behalf of the insane and the blind, brought his great influence to the new party. Henry Wilson, a mechanic, whose early training had been that of the shoemaker's shop, but who understood the path by which to reach the conscience and understanding of the workingmen of Massachusetts better than any other man, had been also a delegate to the convention at Philadelphia, and had united with Judge Allen in denunciation of its surrender of liberty. Stephen C. Phillips, a highly respected merchant of Salem, and formerly a Whig representative from the Essex District, gave the weight of his influence in the same direction. Samuel Hoar, who had been driven from South Carolina when he attempted to argue the case for the imprisoned colored seamen of Massachusetts before the courts of the United States, one of the most distinguished lawyers of the Massachusetts Bar, whom Chief-Justice Shaw declared, at a gathering of the Essex Bar, the most powerful advocate before juries in Massachusetts, came from his retirement in his old age to give his service in the same cause. He headed the call for the first Free Soil convention, held at Worcester on the 28th of June, which was prepared by his son, E. R. Hoar, afterward Judge of the Supreme Court of Massachusetts and Attorney-General of the United States, and member of the Joint High Commission which framed the Treaty

of Washington. Richard H. Dana, master of an exquisite English style, an advocate who used to encounter Rufus Choate on equal terms, threw himself into the cause with all the ardor of his soul. On the Connecticut River, George Ashmun, the most powerful of the Whig champions in Western Massachusetts, found more than his match in Erastus Hopkins.

William Claflin, afterward Speaker, Lieutenant-Governor and Governor in Massachusetts, member of the National House of Representatives, and chairman of the Republican National Committee, was then in early youth. But he had already gained a competent fortune by his business sagacity. He brought to the cause his sound judgment, his warm and affectionate heart and his liberal hand. He was then, as he has ever since been, identified with every good and generous cause. His staunch friendship was then, as it has ever since been, the delight and comfort of the champions of Freedom in strife and obloquy.

Each of these men would have been amply fitted in all respects for the leader of a great party in state or nation. Each of them could have defended any cause in which he was a believer, by whatever champion assailed. They had also their allies and associates among the representatives of the press. Among these were Joseph T. Buckingham of the *Boston Courier*, then the head of the editorial fraternity in Massachusetts; John Milton Earle, the veteran editor of the *Worcester Spy;* William S. Robinson, afterward so widely known as "Warrington," whose wit and keen logic will cause his name to be long preserved among the classics of American literature.

Besides these more conspicuous leaders, there was to be found in almost every town and village in Massachusetts some man eminent among his neighbors for purity of life, for philanthropy and for large intelligence, who was ready to join the new party. The glowing hopes and dreams

and aspirations of youth were inspirited by the muse of Whittier and Longfellow and Lowell and Bryant. The cause of free labor appealed to the strongest sympathies of the mechanics of Essex and the skilled laborers of Worcester :—

> Bliss was it in that dawn to be alive;
> But to be young was Heaven.

A meeting was called to hear Judge Allen's report at the City Hall in Worcester. There was doubt as to his reception, and it was predicted that he could not gain an audience. Some difficulty was experienced in finding any man of prominence to preside; but this office was undertaken by Albert Tolman, one of the most respected mechanics of the city. The hall was thronged long before Judge Allen came upon the platform. Many persons were unable to get admission. From the beginning to the end Judge Allen had the sympathy of the vast audience. The Judge declared that he had been charged by his constituents to vote for a person as candidate for President who should be in favor of preserving the territories of the United States from the stain of slavery. That the convention which sent him to Philadelphia well knew his sentiments, and would have sent some other man as their delegate if they intended to put forth principles upon which they did not mean to stand and abide. He sketched the history of slavery in the country; the manner in which it had extended and grown strong. He showed that the Whigs of the North were pledged against its further extension. He showed that Gen. Taylor had declared that if he were elected to the presidential office he must go untrammelled by party pledges of any character, and must not be brought forward as the candidate of any party, or considered as the exponent of any party doctrines. Gen. Taylor, therefore, refusing to be the candidate of a party or the exponent of its doctrines, had no claim upon his allegiance or that of his auditors as Whigs.

He showed further that Gen. Taylor's Southern neighbors, who knew him best, avowed that he sympathized with them on the subject of the Wilmot Proviso and what they called Southern rights. He uttered his bold challenge to the leading Whigs in Worcester County,—Gov. Lincoln and Gov. Davis. As the assembly was about to disperse, the Rev. George Allen, a brother of the Judge, who had come in late from a religious meeting, made his way to the platform and moved the following resolution, which was passed amid great enthusiasm. It was adopted by nearly every Free Soil meeting held that year in Massachusetts and rang through the country:—"Resolved, that Massachusetts wears no chains, and spurns all bribes. That she goes now and will ever go for Free Soil and Free Men, for Free Lips and a Free Press, for a Free Land and a Free World." That meeting was the inauguration of a political party which made opposition to the further extension of slavery its cardinal principle. The old Liberty party differed from the Free Soil party in that its members were willing to support men belonging to other political organizations if they had confidence in the sincerity of the devotion of the individual candidate to their principles. But the Free Soil party announced, and in no other way could any party expect permanent success in state or nation, that alliance with any other political organization, or the support of any other political candidates than their own, was sufficient reason for rejecting any candidate for office, however personally acceptable. The transformation of the Free Soil party into the Republican, which took place six years later, was but a change of name.

Mr. Allen devoted himself from that time forward to the close of the campaign to the task of convincing the people of Worcester County. It was no slight burden he had undertaken. Worcester County had contended with Genesee County, N. Y., Lancaster County, Pa., and

Ashtabula County, Ohio, for the glory of being the banner Whig county in the United States. She was interested in the success of Whig principles. Her manufactures were rising into importance. Factories were building on every stream. Her only city was devoted to manufactures in great variety. Her people were proud of the policies which had given to Massachusetts the name of the model commonwealth. With the exception of Mr. Webster, her venerated citizens, John Davis and Levi Lincoln, were the most eminent Whigs in Massachusetts.

Gov. Davis had a large national fame and was understood to have favored the selection of Gen. Taylor. At the same time, his course hitherto had commended him to the anti-slavery sentiment of the Commonwealth. Levi Lincoln, who held the office of Governor of Massachusetts longer than any other person before or since, was a man of matchless executive energy, of high social position, of wide family connection, and of unsullied character. He had been chosen Governor of Massachusetts by the consent of both political parties. He had inherited from his father the political opinions and the intimate personal friendship of Jefferson. Yet he had always had the full confidence of the Federal and Whig leaders. When Mr. Webster was first chosen to the United States Senate he declined to be considered as a candidate until he had been first informed, on Mr. Lincoln's own authority, that he would not accept the place; an acceptance which had been urged upon him by Mr. Mills, the retiring senator, and by the leaders of the dominant party in Massachusetts all over the Commonwealth, with scarcely an exception. These two men threw themselves into the support of Taylor, inspired not only by the conviction that Gen. Taylor's election would be for the benefit of the whole country, but also because they saw that their own political dominion and influence were involved in the same issue.

These men had supporters both on the hustings and in the press, from a conflict with whom any common man might well shrink. The *National Ægis* was then under the charge of Alexander H. Bullock, afterward Governor of the Commonwealth, and one of the most brilliant orators of his day. He was aided by the keen and caustic pen of Edward W. Lincoln, and by John C. B. Davis, afterward an eminent lawyer and Minister to Germany. Benjamin F. Thomas, who succeeded Judge Allen as the leader of the Worcester bar, the darling of the younger men of his generation,—a man of whom it has been said, as before him was said of Charles James Fox, that his intellect was all feeling and his feeling all intellect,—who had been an original supporter of Gen. Taylor, advocated his election with his fervid and persuasive eloquence. Emory Washburn, perhaps the best-beloved citizen of Worcester County, was on the same side. The quarrel was not like that of an ordinary party contest. It extended into the social life of the state and county. There was hardly a family moving in what was called good society that was not upon the Whig side. Charles Hudson, the popular and esteemed representative from the Worcester District, the highest authority in his time upon the finances of the country, and especially upon the protective tariff, after some hesitation, had given his support to the nomination of Gen. Taylor.

Yet Charles Allen, from the beginning, held his own against all odds. He was nominated for Congress very much against his own will, and because no other man could be found in the district on his side of sufficient prominence to be made a candidate. The Free Soil party swept the county by a large majority, carrying the City of Worcester and every one of the fifty-two towns, with four exceptions. The Judge was triumphantly elected to Congress. From that time Worcester County never wavered or faltered in the support of freedom, till the three great

amendments were formally established in the Constitution of the United States itself.

Judge Allen served in the Congress of the United States for two terms, when his constituents reluctantly yielded to his desire to withdraw from that service. His health was always delicate. The climate of Washington was extremely unfavorable to him. During his term of service he had many slight illnesses. He also was brought to the point of death by a lung fever. The physicians had no hope that he would live but a few hours, and requested Mr. Giddings, who was his intimate friend, to say to him that if he had any disposition to make of his worldly affairs it should be done without delay, as he had but a very short time to live. The Judge understood his own case better than the doctors. As Giddings leaned over the sick-bed and made the solemn and appalling communication, the patient replied, using all his strength, in a just audible whisper, "We will see about that." To the mortification, if not the disappointment, of the doctors, he recovered.

The question has been discussed a good deal of late, to what men the rescue of our vast Western territory from slavery and the overthrow of slavery itself are most largely due. The admirers of Mr. Garrison and the survivors of the little band who were distinguished by the name of Abolitionists, of whom he was the acknowledged leader, claim for him and for those who thought with him the chief merit in this mighty revolution. I would not, if I could, take a single laurel from the honored brow of William Lloyd Garrison. I stated deliberately my opinion of him when, in presenting for the Commonwealth of Massachusetts the statues of John Winthrop and Samuel Adams to the United States, for the memorial chamber in the Capitol, I spoke of the great men among whom her choice was made in selecting the two foremost names

among her national benefactors. I then used this language :—

"Of the great lovers of their race, whose pure fame is gained by unselfish devotion of their lives to lessening suffering or reforming vice, Massachusetts has furnished conspicuous examples. Among these great benefactors who have now gone to their reward it is hard to determine the palm of excellence.

"To the labors of Horace Mann is due the excellence of the common schools in America, without which liberty must perish, despite of constitution or statute.

"If an archangel should come down from Heaven among men, I cannot conceive that he could give utterance to a loftier virtue or clothe his message in more fitting phrase than are found in the pure eloquence in which Channing arraigned slavery, that giant crime of all ages, before the bar of public opinion, and held up the selfish ambition of Napoleon to the condemnation of mankind. 'Never before,' says the eulogist of Channing, 'in the name of humanity and freedom, was grand offender arraigned by such a voice. The sentence of degradation which Channing has passed, confirmed by coming generations, will darken the fame of the warrior more than any defeat of his armies, or compelled abdication of his power.'

"Dr. Howe, whose youthful service in the War for the Independence of Greece, recalling the stories of knight-errantry, has endeared his name to two hemispheres, is yet better known by what he has done for those unfortunate classes of our fellowmen whom God has deprived of intellect or of sense. He gave eyes to the fingers of the blind; he taught the deaf and dumb articulate speech; waked the slumbering intellect in the darkened soul of the idiot; brought comfort, quiet, hope, courage, to the wretched cell of the insane.

"To each of these the people of Massachusetts have, in their own way, paid their tribute of honor and reverence. The statue of Horace Mann stands by the portal of the State House. The muse of Whittier and Holmes, the lips of our most distinguished living orators, the genius of his gifted wife, have united in a worthy memorial of Howe. The stately eloquence of Sumner, in his great oration at Cambridge, has built a monument to Channing more enduring than marble or granite; but Channing's

published writings, eagerly read wherever the English language prevailed, are better than any monument.

"Yet I believe Channing and Howe and Mann, were they living today, would themselves yield precedence to the constant and courageous heroism of him who said, 'I am in earnest; I will not equivocate; I will not retreat a single inch; and I will be heard'; whose fame—

> 'Over his living head, like heaven, is bent
> An early and eternal monument.'"

Of this estimate I have nothing to retract. But I cannot consent to honor Mr. Garrison at the expense of what is due to others. Mr. Garrison devoted his life to the cause of human freedom. In that cause he encountered hatred, obloquy and peril. He espoused the cause of the poor and downtrodden when it seemed almost hopeless to other men, inspired by a sublime and undoubting confidence in righteousness and the justice of God. He was a man of absolute integrity and veracity. His appeals did much to create and strengthen the hatred of slavery in the American people, to whom he was as a conscience, bringing everything to the standard of rectitude as it appeared to his eyes. But as we now look back upon his work we can see that he impaired his own usefulness by one supreme error in judgment. His only plan for the overthrow of slavery was the destruction of his country itself. If his counsel had been followed there would have been today at the South a great slaveholding empire, spreading over all the territory between the Mississippi and the Pacific, embracing Cuba and, perhaps, Mexico; while the North would have been a feeble and distracted country; or, perhaps, divided into many separate states, weak and contemptible among the nations of the earth. We cannot, therefore, while we assign to Garrison the highest place which belongs to a pure purpose and to an unselfish devotion, give to him, who as a counsellor and leader was always wrong in the method of accomplishing

his end, a meed of praise which we are to deny such leaders as Charles Allen and Charles Sumner, who, as we look back upon their lives, we now see to have been always right. Mr. Garrison was misled by a strict interpretation of the Constitution. He forgot that there was a country behind the Constitution which could amend it, which could overthrow it, which could construe it in favor of liberty, and the preservation of whose life was, if not the only, yet the best hope of liberty in this world. No lover of his race, no friend of the freedom of the black, can now look back upon the counsel of Charles Allen or the men who acted with him and wish that in any respect it had been otherwise.

The causes which have been mentioned prevented Mr. Allen from taking a very active part on the floor of the House during his two terms of service in Washington. But he was regarded by the few anti-slavery men there as their wisest and ablest counsellor. Mr. Julian of Indiana, who was himself one of the most earnest anti-slavery men in the public service, and who served with Mr. Allen during his whole time, has written his recollection of Mr. Allen's congressional career as follows :—

Centreville, Indiana,
Sept. 10th, 1870.

Hon. Geo. F. Hoar:

My Dear Sir,—

Failing health and other hindrances have prevented an earlier response to your request, made some months ago, to give you my impressions of the late Judge Allen of your state. My first knowledge of him dates back as far as the summer of 1848, when I read his speech to his constituents, on his return from the Philadelphia Whig Convention which nominated Gen. Taylor for the Presidency in June of that year. This speech, which was copied into several Western newspapers, was a telling one, and exercised a marked influence, especially upon those members of the Free Soil organization who enlisted from the ranks of the Whigs. I first met Judge Allen in

December, 1849, as a fellow-member of the House of Representatives in the memorable Congress which then assembled, and as a fellow-member also of the little party of less than a dozen men who disowned all allegiance to both the Whig and Democratic parties. Boarding at the same place with Judge Allen and a few other congenial friends during nearly the whole of the two sessions of this Congress, which together lasted over thirteen months, I had, of course, the amplest means of knowing him intimately. In his ordinary intercourse with others, and as a member of the House also, he was so quiet and undemonstrative that few comprehended his rare intellectual gifts, or the singular charm of his manner as he revealed himself to his intimate friends. I may add, too, that even at this comparatively early day in his career he labored under the serious disadvantage of feeble health. The slave power also, then in the full sweep of its despotism, took good care, of course, to keep such men in the background. Even Thaddeus Stevens, who in later years became so famous as a debater and party leader, and had offended the black oligarchy so much less than Judge Allen, was not able in this Congress to write down any clear prophecy of the career which awaited him when perfectly unshackled by the power which then held him in check. The men who resisted the organization of the House in the interest of slavery for weeks in succession, and thus offended both slaveholders and doughfaces, could expect no coveted place on the committees and no political favors in any quarter. Judge Allen, however, whenever his health would permit, was at his post of duty, ever watchful of the proceedings of Congress, and conscientiously resolved to act well his part as a servant of the people. On a few occasions, of which his encounter with Mr. Ashmun is an example, his reserved power was strikingly brought out, and the House listened to him with admiration and breathless interest. Judge Allen was passionately fond of English literature. On entering his room I always found on his table "Half Hours with the Best Authors" or some favorite volume of poetry; and I used to listen to his readings with delight. He was master of the rare art of good reading, knowing exactly how to give to the hearer the full force and compass of his author's meaning. He was uncommonly familiar with theological and religious literature, and his conversation on these

topics was full of instruction. In his occasional discussions of political issues with those who differed from him, it was impossible to escape the real point in dispute. He never failed to bring his opponent promptly back to it, and pin him there if he sought to escape; and when he detected in him any form of sophistry or dishonesty was sure to make him disagreeably sensible of it. There was a vein of sarcasm about him which I have never seen excelled. It was keen and terrible; but he uniformly reserved it for fit occasions and for subjects that deserved it. His love of justice and truth was supreme, but his heart was as sunny and kind as that of a child.

The political and social ostracism of the little party of radicals with whom he was associated in Washington was keenly felt, and led to weekly social meetings at the residence of Dr. Bailey, of the *National Era*, where we frequently met leading anti-slavery people from various sections. These were most delightful occasions, showing the delightful social tendencies of the members, and indicating the struggle it must have cost them to break away from cherished associations and stand alone in defence of hated political doctrines. If left to his natural inclinations, I think Judge Allen would never have filled a public office; and I am quite sure he would have shunned the hard and ungracious strife of party politics. He was, in the very best sense, a patriot; and, therefore, while singularly fitted to enjoy the sweet quiet of home, and to charm in the social circle and around the fireside, he listened only to the voice of duty when summoned to the public service.

I infer from his frequent conversations about Mr. Webster, that his personal and political relations with him had been the kindliest. Up to the last moment, I think, he clung to the hope that Webster would not go over to the South; and it was a real grief to him when he found himself finally disappointed. On the memorable 7th of March, Judge Allen was not able to be in the House. I happened that day to be in the Senate and heard the whole of the recreant speech which recorded Mr. Webster's apostasy from his New England faith. On returning from the session, I related to Judge Allen what had happened, giving him the chief points of the speech and attempting to describe the effort, almost amounting to an agony, which it seemed to cost Mr. Webster to deliver it. I shall never forget the inexpressible

sadness of Judge Allen's face as I gave him these particulars. The fatal step had now been taken and thenceforward he must, of course, regard Webster as the enemy of his country, because the enemy of liberty. The pang caused by this event, affecting as it must his social relations with Mr. Webster, was patiently endured, in the desire to stand all the more firmly by the cause of freedom, now dearer than ever because more than ever imperilled by the faithlessness of its friends.

Of the controversy which followed between Judge Allen and Mr. Webster it is, perhaps, needless to speak. I believed at the time, as I still do, that Judge Allen was right in the charges made by him against Mr. Webster, in March, 1851; and I was willing, therefore, to offer in the House a preamble and resolutions calling for an investigation. The House, then in the complete control of men who had surrendered the country to the keeping of the slave power, very naturally voted down the proposed inquiry. It was never officially made; but Judge Allen's good name suffered no detriment in the judgment of his countrymen by reason of his charges. On the contrary, I think it safe to say that the general verdict has been in his favor. Time has awarded justice to both parties, and this is all that the friends of Judge Allen could ask. Should the friends of Mr. Webster, however, see fit at any time to drag this controversy again before the public, and insist upon a rehearing, I doubt not that facts in abundance can be produced in justification of the investigation which was proposed.

As to Judge Allen's course, in connection with the other Free Soil members of the House, in resisting its organization under Mr. Winthrop, time has fully vindicated him and his co-laborers. They were ready at all times to vote for Thaddeus Stevens, as for any other Whig for Speaker who could be trusted; but they knew Mr. Winthrop to be false to freedom, and, therefore, they did right in resolutely refusing to vote for him. Many good men then thought they were mistaken; but the subsequent action of Mr. Winthrop himself has removed all doubts as to the wisdom of their course. Nor does Judge Allen's conduct need any vindication in separating himself from the Whig party, in 1848, and joining the anti-slavery revolt of that year. That movement did not carry the electoral vote of a single state; but its moral effect saved Oregon from slavery, made California a free state,

secured cheap postage to the people, and launched the policy of free homes on the public domain which finally prevailed in 1862. Nor can history fail to record that the Free Soil movement was the prophecy and parent of the larger one which rallied under Frémont in 1856, under Lincoln in 1860, and which finally saved the nation from destruction by the armed rebels whom it had vanquished at the ballot-box. The leaders in this grand uprising of 1848 are, therefore, not unworthy of their country's honor and praise; and of all these leaders, whether in New England or out of it, I rank Charles Allen second to none in ability, courage, singleness of purpose, and the power to inspire and wisely guide his fellow-men. In the grasp and poise of his mind I believe no man in New England, save Webster, was his superior, in the judgment of those who knew him best; while the purity of his life and the loftiness of his patriotism are unquestioned and unquestionable. Such are my views and impressions, drawn from a brief but intimate acquaintance, which closed nearly twenty years ago; and it affords me a real pleasure to record them in compliance with your wishes.

I am, very truly yours,

GEO. W. JULIAN.

After the defeat of Gen. Scott, it was proposed by the leaders of the Free Soil party in Washington, at a meeting held at the house of Dr. Bailey, editor of the *National Era*, to abandon their distinctive organization, and either unite again with the Whigs or abandon political effort altogether. Ephraim seemed given over to his idols. The Democratic party was triumphant everywhere. Their Whig competitors had declared their acquiescence in the compromise measures of 1850. Slavery was intrenched in House, Senate, the Presidency, the Supreme Court, in trade, commerce, at the Bar, and in the highest social circles of all the great cities. It seemed to many men that its enemies were but beating their heads against walls. Such was the feeling of the little band of discouraged champions who gathered at Dr. Bailey's the winter after the election of Franklin Pierce to discuss their future prospects. Mr. Allen, however, was not one of the dis-

couraged. He maintained that it would be impossible for the slave power to remain stationary; that some new encroachment would occur before long which would excite the North and inspire new confidence in the opponents of slavery. It is said that he advocated these views in a speech of great power, and succeeded in impressing the meeting with his own good cheer. His prophecy was verified early in the following administration, by Mr. Douglas's proposition to repeal the Missouri Compromise, followed soon after by the struggle between the settlers from the free and slave states for the possession of Kansas, and by the Dred Scott decision.

During Mr. Allen's term of service the Compromise measures of 1850 were discussed and enacted. Mr. Allen came home from Washington in the autumn of that year, and addressed his constituents in two speeches of marvellous power. In 1848 he had prayed "That God might keep Daniel Webster from the toils of the slave power, and that we might be spared from the sight of that strong man grinding in the prison-house of the Philistines." After Mr. Webster's 7th of March speech, Mr. Allen's last hope of support from Mr. Webster was abandoned. He denounced his old leader and friend in language which justice to him and to those who thought with him requires us to preserve, as showing the temper of the times and the boldness with which the most powerful character was assailed by Judge Allen in the defence of what he believed the cause of righteousness and constitutional liberty:—

"Mr. Webster, I know, says that the opinion of no man who denies the constitutionality of this measure [the Fugitive Slave Law] is of any worth. In the usual arrogant style in which he sees fit of late to address the public, he declares that the opinion, which has been expressed by intelligent men, by lawyers and jurists, and by able minds in every department of life, that the law is against the spirit, if not the letter, of the Constitution, is not worthy of consideration. He assumes to dictate to the people the

true construction of the Constitution, in a matter deeply affecting them; and he declares that the hundreds and thousands of voices, already raised in all parts of the country to denounce this measure for its unconstitutionality, are to be disregarded or treated with contempt.

"My friends, I know well the great intelligence of that distinguished man, Daniel Webster. I know very well the power of his mighty intellect, how it stands out in monstrous disproportion to every other attribute of the man. I bow in silent wonder before the mysterious dispensation of Providence which saw fit to confer so much intellectual power where there was so little moral strength. My friends, Mr. Webster never will vindicate the principles of the Free Soil party. Never! Never! The Free Soil party has no pensions to bestow upon him. Freedom has no chain of gold to bind the giant to her service. She seeks for no such service. But she asks the aid and assistance of honest minds and earnest hearts,—of men who cannot be bought by gold, and who will not be beguiled of their rights by gold-bought sophistry. My friends, what is knowledge, what is wisdom, without goodness as a guide in the affairs of life? And what but a demon would the greatest intellect which the Deity ever created be if it stood independent of goodness? The world has had examples of men in all ages who were gifted with great powers of intellect, and who yet would fall before temptations which the feeblest of mankind often resist. The instances, as you know, have not been few, but many,—so many that, I trust, the people have long since learned to disregard the dictation of mere intellect where there are no qualities of the heart also upon which they can rely.

"I call to mind at this moment one of the most distinguished men the world ever knew. It will be no disparagement to say that he possessed an intellect superior even to that of Mr. Webster himself. Certainly his attainments in every department of knowledge were far superior. And yet he sank before temptations which the weakest resist, and was dismissed from the highest place of state in disgrace and with contempt. That man, characterized as 'the wisest, brightest, meanest of mankind,' stands on the page of history as a warning to the world that intelligence

and virtue are not inseparably combined, and that you must see to it that the brilliant intellect to which you turn for guidance and direction, is itself controlled and directed by unwavering principle. My friends, I have a right thus to speak of Mr. Webster, and it is my duty to speak thus of him. It is the duty of every man, even of the feeblest, to exert what little strength he has to prevent the fountains of public sentiment from being poisoned by the statesman who has turned all the energy of his great mind in a direction hostile to the public interest. I have a right thus to speak of him from what we know and what we believe of the inducements and motives which gave a new direction to his whole political action. When we find him turning his back upon principles which he had advocated in the most solemn manner again and again, not in his youth merely, but in the maturity of his great mind, which he had early vindicated, which he had at all periods sustained; when we find him changing his position, arraying himself on the side of oppression, and seeking to delude the whole public into the same false position, we have a right to say that the man is not to be trusted as a guide to the people. Rather trust the feeblest intellect that sheds its glimmering though feeble light over the path of duty."

This arraignment of Mr. Webster cannot be omitted without omitting an important part of the political history of the time, and especially an important act in the career of Charles Allen. As we look back today, nearly forty years, upon these great events and these great actors, we can discover reasons for modifying the severe judgment which the lovers of liberty of his day rendered of the motives and conduct of Daniel Webster. We can see that he might well have been sincere in his belief that it would not be in the power of the South to fasten itself upon the unoccupied territory of the West, even without any national prohibition. Certainly California and Kansas, under most unfavorable circumstances, were rescued from the blight of slavery without any exertion of national authority. We can also see that the fear of a dissolution

of the Union, which so impressed the mind of Mr. Webster, was not the idle fancy which his opponents at that day were accustomed to believe it. We can see, too, that if the struggle had come between the North and the South in 1850, before the extension of our railroad system, before the great increase of wealth, and especially the increase of manufacturing power which came to the North in the ten years' interval, and before steam-power had come into use on vessels of war, that a war undertaken for the coercion or conquest of the South might have had a very different ending from that of the struggle which broke out in 1861. We can also well believe that if Daniel Webster's life had been spared he would have been found, as his follower and friend, Edward Everett, was found, among the most zealous defenders of his country, and that all his sympathies would have been given to the Union in a war in which, as it has been well said, every cannon on that side was shotted with his great reply to Hayne.

The men who condemned Daniel Webster, and the men who came to his side, had alike drunk deeply of the inspiration of his own teaching. He had taught the youth of New England, at Plymouth and at Bunker Hill, to reverence beyond all other human objects of esteem the men who had abandoned their country and the men who had taken up arms against their government that civil liberty might not perish. He had pledged them on the rock where their ancestors landed to co-operate with the laws of men and the justice of heaven to extirpate and destroy the slave trade. How came he to be advocating a Fugitive Slave Law, and helping to extend the area of slavery from the Mississippi to the Pacific? On the other hand, it was he that first taught America her own greatness; that had evoked the national spirit in the bosoms of his countrymen, and taught them that their best hope lay in the supremacy of the Constitution and the Union. Should they not listen when he warned them that the

Union was in danger, and demanded of them obedience to the plain behest of the Constitution as the price of its safety? One side appealed to the love of liberty: the other to the love of country. One side appealed to the voice of conscience in the soul; the other invoked the decisions of Congress and the supremacy of national law.

The judgment which the Free Soilers of 1850 formed of Daniel Webster and the judgment which his countrymen, even those who differed from him, have formed, after the passion and excitement of his time have died, are both expressed in a manner which no other man can equal, by John G. Whittier, that master of every chord in the hearts of his countrymen, in two matchless poems. In each of them he spake truly the sentiment of anti-slavery New England. "Ichabod" was its first voice of disappointment and sorrow:—

"So fallen! so lost! the light withdrawn
Which once he wore!
The glory from his gray hairs gone
Forevermore.

Revile him not—the Tempter hath
A snare for all;
And pitying tears, not scorn and wrath,
Befit his fall!

O, dumb be passion's stormy rage,
When he who might
Have lighted up and led his age,
Falls back in night.

Scorn! would the angels laugh, to mark
A bright soul driven,
Fiend-goaded, down the endless dark,
From Hope and Heaven!

Let not the land once proud of him
Insult him now,
Nor brand with deeper shame his dim,
Dishonored brow.

But let its humbled sons, instead,
From sea to lake,
A long lament, as for the dead,
In sadness make.

Of all we loved and honored, naught
Save power remains,—
A fallen angel's pride of thought,
Still strong in chains.

All else is gone, from those great eyes
The soul has fled:
When Faith is lost, when Honor dies,
The man is dead!

Then, pay the reverence of old days
To his dead fame;
Walk backward, with averted gaze,
And hide the shame!"

The "Lost Occasion" expressed its riper and its gentler judgment:—

"Too soon for us, too soon for thee,
Beside thy lonely Northern sea,
Where long and low the marsh-lands spread,
Laid wearily down thy august head.

Thou shouldst have lived to feel below
Thy feet Disunion's fierce upthrow,—
The late-sprung mine that underlaid
Thy sad concessions vainly made.

Thou shouldst have seen from Sumter's wall
The star-flag of the Union fall,
And armed Rebellion pressing on
The broken lines of Washington!

No stronger voice than thine had then
Called out the utmost might of men,
To make the Union's charter free
And strengthen law by liberty.

How had that stern arbitrament
To thy gray age youth's vigor lent,
Shaming ambition's paltry prize
Before thy disillusioned eyes;

Breaking the spell about thee wound
Like the green withes that Samson bound;
Redeeming, in one effort grand,
Thyself and thy imperilled land!

Ah, cruel fate, that closed to thee,
O sleeper by the Northern sea,
The gates of opportunity!
God fills the gaps of human need,
Each crisis brings its word and deed.

Wise men and strong we did not lack;
But still, with memory turning back,
In the dark hours we thought of thee,
And thy lone grave beside the sea."

But we must describe Charles Allen, and tell the story of his life as it was. We must do justice to the heroic courage which never quailed or flinched before the most powerful antagonist that either Massachusetts or America ever produced.

Judge Allen lived to see the triumph of the great cause which he had espoused in its infancy and weakness. He lived to see slavery abolished by the Thirteenth Amendment to the Constitution. He lived to enjoy the respect of the people of the Commonwealth, without distinction of party or opinion. The dauntless advocate of liberty, the wise, learned and inflexible judge and stainless citizen, received the only reward for which he cared,—the affection and honor of good men everywhere. His private life had been simple and frugal. He could say with John Milton, "I am not one who has disgraced beauty of sentiment by deformity of conduct, or the maxims of a freeman by the actions of a slave; but, by the grace of God, I have kept my life unsullied."

During his second term in Congress, a proposal was made to entrust the negotiation of a government loan for paying the expenses of the Mexican War, and the sum to be paid to Mexico as an equivalent for her cession of territory, to the Department of State, of which Mr. Webster

was then the head. Judge Allen earnestly resisted this proposition. He claimed that the well-known fact that Mr. Webster was enabled to defray his large household expenditure while he held office by contributions from business men, largely brokers and bankers, unfitted him for the discharge of the delicate duty of negotiating a loan with them; a transaction from which they might well expect to derive a considerable profit. But he found no support on either side of the House.

Mr. Allen left Congress, contrary to the earnest desires of his constituents, at the end of his second term, on the third of March, 1853. But he maintained his leadership in the politics of Worcester County, and his large influence in the state, until he went upon the bench in 1858. He was a member of the Convention to revise the Constitution in 1853, where he exerted a powerful influence. The new constitution proposed by that convention was rejected by the people; but the volumes containing its debates are full of interest. Some of Mr. Allen's speeches will be found there reported. In 1854 the Know Nothing party, as it was called, whose fundamental principle was the desire to exclude men of foreign birth from the right to vote in this country, came into power. It elected, in the autumn of 1854, the entire State Government of Massachusetts, including every member of the Senate, and every member of the House but two representatives from the town of Northampton, and the entire delegation in Congress. Many of Mr. Allen's most prominent associates, including Henry Wilson, yielded to the torrent, and either joined the new party, which held its meetings in secret, or counselled against any active resistance. But the whole movement was repugnant to Charles Allen. He set his face steadfastly against it from the first to the last. He addressed a little company of followers, who gathered on the front seats in the old City Hall, in a speech which I well remember. In

the course of his speech he denounced the Know Nothing movement, to whose principles and methods he was earnestly opposed. He said, "Perhaps I am speaking too boldly, but I learned to speak boldly a long time ago. I will speak my sentiments in the face of any organization; or, if it does not show its face, though its secret mines are beneath my feet, and unseen hands ready to apply the match, I will declare those sentiments that a freeman is bound to utter." The speech was filled with the powerful and profound reasoning and the caustic wit which were alike characteristic of Mr. Allen. The candidate of the Republican party for Governor had himself joined the Know Nothings, and was advocating the election of their candidate and his own defeat. Mr. Allen's only allusion to him was in a single sentence. He said to his audience, "Fellow citizens, there is much in this campaign from which you may take courage; you have a very respectable candidate for Lieutenant-Governor." He lived to take a leading part, in the fall of 1857, in the movement for the nomination of Gov. Banks, which led to the overthrow of Know Nothing power in Massachusetts, and to the permanent establishment of the rule of the Republican party.

The Know Nothing party carried to an unjustifiable extreme its opposition to citizens of foreign birth. Its political methods, especially the secrecy of its proceedings, are not to be defended. As old Josiah Quincy well said in a vigorous pamphlet, "The doom of the Republic is sealed when the bats take the lead of the eagles." But many persons who joined it cared little for its principles. They did not mean to continue long in its ranks; still less to continue long in its practice of secrecy. But they thought it an excellent weapon for the destruction of the old parties, who stood in the way of the progress of free principles. They thought if the old ground were cleared and levelled, with whatever plough, they might get fresher and better crops in future. Henry Wilson joined the

party one year and abandoned it the next. He was the candidate of the Republican party for Governor in 1854, and did his best as a Know Nothing to defeat his own election. Within twelve months Mr. Wilson had been elected to the Senate of the United States and the Republican party had been organized. It came within a few thousand votes of electing its Governor in the autumn of 1855. Most of the members of the Know Nothing party returned to the Democratic party or joined the Republican party in the presidential election of 1856. The autumn of 1857 witnessed its final overthrow in Massachusetts. It soon afterward disappeared. Mr. Wilson declared later in life that his connection with that party was the fact in his career which he most regretted, and that he would give ten years of his life if he could wipe it out.

Mr. Allen took an active part in the formation of the Republican party in 1854, which, however, got little assistance from anybody but members of the old Free Soil party, and was, in fact, but that party under another name. In 1855 the attempt was renewed with greater success, and with Mr. Allen's hearty concurrence. But in that he found plenty of associates, and the course of events soon brought a large majority of the people of the state into that organization.

Mr. Allen presided at the great meeting in Worcester in aid of the Free State settlers in Kansas, in the year 1856, where he made a speech of great power, and where the citizens of Worcester raised upward of ten thousand dollars by voluntary contribution before leaving the hall. He also presided at the great meeting in the City Hall to express the public indignation at the assault on Charles Sumner in 1856. But the work of convincing the conscience and understanding of the people of Massachusetts and of organizing its political forces had been thoroughly done. Mr. Allen's last important service was in the great

influence which he exerted in bringing about the nomination of Gov. Banks, in the autumn of 1857.

He understood well and knew how to apply in practical life two of the most important texts of scripture,—the verse, "We have this treasure in earthen vessels," and the parable of the tares. I admit that both these are texts dangerous of application by men of weak intelligence or of weak moral sense. But to know when and how to apply them is to know the secret of the difference between a statesman and a fanatic. It is the secret of the difference between success and failure. He knew well that when a great cause is at stake, in the very crisis of battle, it is no time to be criticising and carping at the faults or foibles of the leader, so the battle be well ordered and the heart of the leader be true. He understood, also, that oftentimes in the life of all nations the tares cannot be uprooted without destruction to the wheat, and that both must grow together until the harvest. But he never flinched or faltered or held back from striking his mortal blow at the enemy who sowed them.

The relation of Charles Allen to the political revolution in Massachusetts was like that of his kinsman, Sam Adams, to the Revolution of 1775. He performed, with signal ability and to the entire satisfaction of his associates and of the people, every public duty which fell upon him. But, besides and beyond this, he was a leader of leaders,—a counsellor of counsellors. He had the gift of intellectual ascendency over other minds, which, like that of Hamilton and of Sam Adams, seemed to be more complete the abler and more powerful the intellect on which his influence was exerted. There were men in the days which preceded the American Revolution more famous than Sam Adams. To a superficial observation their words and actions seemed to exert a greater influence on their contemporaries or on posterity. Hancock and John Adams and James Otis in Massachusetts, Patrick Henry and Jefferson and the other

great Virginians, produced more striking effects by single speeches or state papers than any which are recorded of Sam Adams. But he furnished, even to them, counsel, courage, decision, stimulant in great and difficult emergencies. He was ever at the helm, or it was his word that the helmsman obeyed. Ample proof of this statement will be found in the writings of the greatest of his contemporaries.

The same thing is true of Charles Allen, in his relation to the great political revolution which saved from slavery the territory between the Mississippi and the Pacific and, in the end, abolished slavery throughout the country. Sumner and Palfrey and Charles Francis Adams sat at the feet of Charles Allen and looked up to him as to an oracle and guide. His unerring judgment never failed, his courage never flinched. There cannot be found in his history the record of a single mistake.

Another thing is specially to be remarked of the career of Charles Allen; that is, the wisdom with which he selected the occasion when it was worth while to do battle. He is not found criticising his associates or his opponents for small personal faults. He never wasted his strength. He knew how to distinguish what is essential from what is non-essential. He never dealt his blows at antagonists who were sure to destroy themselves if let alone, and never gave battle when the result of the conflict was likely to be unimportant or without influence upon the final result of the war. He never destroyed the wheat with the tares. He devoted himself to the great question, not to the small question. He attacked the great antagonist and disregarded the mean antagonist. He struck his blow at the Whig party in the height and flush of its triumph. He attacked Daniel Webster in the fulness of his strength and influence. He struck at the heart and his blow was mortal. Other men, more conspicuous in the public eye, have received a larger share of credit for their service in

the great conflict for freedom. We would not pluck away one of their laurels, or detract in the least from their well-earned fame. But let us not forget him who was never mistaken in his counsel; whose Abdiel stroke was ever dealt at the right time and in the right place; who knew how to seize the moment; whose cheerful and confident courage never abated in the darkest hour and never failed in the presence of the most powerful antagonist.

39 W

WERT BOOKBINDING
JAN 1989
Grantville, PA